

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-13, 15-28, 30-32 are pending in the application.

Applicant amends claims 20-23, 25 to correct a minor typographical error. The claims now read as being dependent from claim 16 rather than claim 1 as provided earlier.

Claim Rejections under §101

Claims 15-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 16-29 and 31 are rejected on the basis that the claimed apparatus lacks hardware to perform the listed steps. (*Office Action dated 09/12/06*, page 3). The claim is amended to clarify Applicant's claim by including positive recitation of computer elements of a processor and memory. Further, the following section is reproduced from the Specification of Applicant's patent application regarding the term logic as used in the claims.

The term "logic" as used herein generally represents software, firmware, or a combination of software and firmware. In the case of a software implementation, the logic represents program code that performs specified tasks when executed on a processing device or devices (e.g., CPU or CPUs). The program code can be stored in one or more computer readable memory devices. (Page 8, lines 10-14 of the Specification)

Applicant respectfully requests that the § 101 rejection be removed in view of the amendments.

Claims 15, 30 and 32 are rejected on the basis that they are directed to “computer readable medium including machine readable instructions”, which can comprise wireless telecommunication signals and carrier waves, forms of energy. (*Office Action dated 09/12/06*, page 4). Applicant amends claims 15, 30 and 32 so as to recite ‘computer readable *storage* medium’. Applicant asserts that such storage media are tangible and are exemplified by the text at page 23 lines 4 -16 of the specification as originally filed. Applicant asserts that such amendments to claims 15, 30 and 32 fully addresses the section 101 rejection and respectfully requests such rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under § 103

Claims 1-13, 15-28, 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,076,541 to Burstein et al (hereinafter “Burstein”) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0133664 to Colvig et al (hereinafter “Colvig”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the elements of original claim 14, thereby essentially rendering claim 1 the same as original claim 14. Thus, claim 1 now recites a method of notifying a user of the activation of a domain, comprising:

- receiving a domain change request from a requesting entity;
- logging information obtained from the domain change request;
- monitoring a change implementation entity to determine when a domain specified in the domain change request has become active; and
- sending a notification to a recipient entity when the domain has been determined to become active, *wherein the sending of the notification comprises sending an electronic mail message to the recipient entity.*

Burstein is concerned with providing a method and an apparatus by which an unaccredited registrar can access the shared registry system (SRS). The SRS is a system that permits the multiple registrars to provide registration service for .com, .net, and .org domains. (*Burstein*, Col 2, lines 51-53). The SRS allows accredited registrars to provide registration services. (*Burstein*, Col 2, lines 58-59). Unaccredited registrars generally access the SRS through accredited registrars. (*Burstein*, Col 4, lines 48-50). It is desirable for unaccredited registrars to provide such services because it provides the users a type of "one stop shopping". (*Burstein*, Col 4, lines 50-54).

Burstein allows an unaccredited registrar to access the SRS by providing a domain management system comprising a front-end domain manager and a back-end domain manager. (*Burstein*, Col 3, lines 15-23). The front-end domain manager is utilized by unaccredited registrars to process registration requests. (*Burstein*, Col 4, lines 59-63). The back-end server has direct access to the SRS and is of the type found within an accredited registrar. (*Burstein*, Col 4, lines 63-65). The unaccredited registrar uses the front-end to process requests received by it from the users.

Colvig is concerned with the IP address of a server from a remote operator station. (*Colvig*, Paragraph 18). The user submits a request for change of IP address to the server using first IP address. (*Colvig*, Paragraph 18). The server provides an HTML page/applet to the remote operator station. (*Colvig*, Paragraph 50). Using the received applet, the remote operator station begins to ping the server using the first IP address. (*Colvig*, Paragraph 50). The remote operator station continues to ping the server with the first IP address until server ceases

responding. (*Colvig*, Paragraph 52). Thereupon, a visual message may be displayed on the remote operator station that the server is bringing up the TCP/IP services using the second IP address. (*Colvig*, paragraph 54, 74).

The Office with respect to claim 14 states that 'sending of the notification comprises sending an electronic mail message to the recipient entity' is taught by *Colvig* where IP address is sent and received between computers. (*Office Action dated 09/12/06*, page 13). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office.

As discussed above, a remote operator station used to change the IP address of a name server monitors the change by means of an HTML page with an applet received from the server. In certain embodiments of the remote operator stations having visual displays, *Colvig* states that when the server IP address is changed, a visual message is sent to the remote operator station. (*Colvig*, paragraph 54, 74). However, this is not the same as an 'electronic mail message' as the message sent is specific to the monitoring entity vis-à-vis specific to the machine. An electronic mail message on the other hand is person/entity specific rather than program/machine specific. Thus, *Colvig* fails to teach the above claim element. Further, *Burstein* fails to add any teaching with respect to this claim. Thus the combination of *Burstein* and *Colvig* does not teach or suggest the above claim element.

As the above claim is not taught by the combination of *Burstein* and *Colvig*, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 1-13, 15 depend from claim 1 and rejections with regard to these claims be withdrawn by virtue of the dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, are not taught or suggested by the combination of *Burstein* and *Colvig*.

Claim 16 is amended to incorporate elements of claim 29 thereby essentially rendering claim 16 the same as original claim 29.

For the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Burstein and Colvig does not teach this claim. Namely, the cited references do not teach 'the notification logic is configured to send the notification by sending an electronic mail message to the recipient entity.' This is because, as discussed earlier, the visual message sent to the remote operator station in Colvig does not teach or suggest the above element.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of §103 rejections with respect to claim 16 for at least the same reasons described above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 17-28, 30 depend from claim 16 and the rejections with respect to these claims be withdrawn by virtue of the dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 16, define elements not taught by the combination of Burstein and Colvig.

Claim 31 as amended recites an apparatus for notifying a user of the activation of a domain, comprising:

means for receiving a domain change request from a requesting entity;

means for logging information obtained from the domain change request;

means for monitoring a change implementation entity to determine when a domain specified in the domain change request has become active; and

means for sending a notification to a recipient entity when the domain has been determined to become active, *wherein the sending of the notification comprises sending an electronic mail message to the recipient entity.*

For the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Burstein and Colvig does not teach this claim. Namely, the cited references do not teach 'sending of the notification comprises sending an electronic mail message to the recipient entity.' This is because, as discussed earlier, the visual message sent to the remote operator station in Colvig does not teach or suggest the above element.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of §103 rejections with respect to claim 31 for at least the same reasons described above with respect to claim 1.


Dependent claim 32 depends from claim 31 and the rejections with respect to this claim be withdrawn by virtue of the dependency. Moreover, this claim recites features that, when taken together with those of claim 16, defines elements not taught by the combination of Burstein and Colvig.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Feb. 9, 2007

By: 
Lewis C. Lee
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256